

Christian Education

Vol. XII

APRIL, 1929

No. 7

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

ALFRED WMS. ANTHONY

ISMAR J. PERITZ

HERBERT E. EVANS

GARDINER M. DAY

*Published Monthly, Omitting July, August and September, at
Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.*

*By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the
United States of America
111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.*

October, 1928, to June, 1929

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$1.50 per annum; ten or more subscriptions \$1.00 each; 25 cents for single copies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Editorials</i>	
The College Teacher	399
Exigent Educational Maxims	400
Just a Few Questions Concerning a Liberal Education.....	401
Great Teachers—and Methods of Developing Them, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i>	402
<i>Department of Biblical Instruction</i>	
Editorial, <i>Ismar J. Peritz</i>	421
The Growing Teacher, <i>W. R. Cullom</i>	422
The Teacher of Religion, <i>Walter N. Stearns</i>	427
A Criticism, <i>S. E. Stout</i>	429
The Presbyterian General Assembly of 1928, <i>Ralph K. Hickok</i>	430
The Colleges of the Disciples of Christ, <i>Floyd W. Reeves</i>	433
A Five Year Program of Voluntary Sunday Bible Study	
Courses for College Students, <i>Martin S. Bryant</i>	439
Religion and Catholicity, <i>Nicholas Murray Butler</i>	447
Appointment of Church Advisers at Columbia University.....	455
The Seminary World	457
The Worker's Bookshelf	460
Here and There	461

"THERE WAS A MORE NEARLY UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY ON THE BASIS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF REPLIES RECEIVED THAT GREAT TEACHERS HAVE POSITIVE RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE THAN IN ANY OTHER ITEM OF APPRAISAL."

R. L. Kelly, p. 420.

Christian Education

Vol. XII

APRIL, 1929

No. 7

EDITORIAL

THE COLLEGE TEACHER

A Live Issue

At the suggestion of the Council of Church Boards of Education the theme "The College Teacher" was generally chosen by the various agencies meeting at Chattanooga in January. The echoes of this meeting are still reverberating and evidently will continue to do so for some time. The appraisal of the "great teacher" and the description of present methods of building faculties presented at the Thursday morning joint meeting, made possible because of the cordial cooperation of about 200 colleges affiliated with the Boards of this Council, evidently were stimulating and timely.

Already an educational body of national scope is considering the feasibility of issuing a book of short and informing biographies of "great college teachers," and the School of Education of one of the leading state universities has circularized the colleges and universities of the country in the effort to get descriptions of what they designate "superior" teachers. Some of the sessions of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in Chicago in March continued the discussion begun at Chattanooga, particularly the suggestions made to members of the Association of American Colleges and to the deans of the graduate schools in universities holding membership in the Association of American Universities; and at the Annual Ohio Educational Conference at Ohio State University, April 5, there was continued and earnest consideration of the same subject.

Undoubtedly, headway is being made in discovering more vital ways of evaluating college teachers and, indeed, colleges them-

selves, than those that have been heretofore and are now generally in use.

To readers of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION the fact is impressive that by our correspondents the quality of the great teacher reported with greater unanimity than any other single quality was that he exercised a distinct and helpful religious influence on his students. In his summary of the situation, Dr. Charles R. Mann, of the American Council on Education, put this characteristic of the great teacher in these words: "He fosters religious faith."—*R. L. K.*

EXIGENT EDUCATIONAL MAXIMS

An attendant at the meetings of the Council of Church Boards of Education and of the Association of American Colleges in Chattanooga, January 7-12, found occurring in addresses, resolutions and conclusions expressed, the following maxims which, though stated now somewhat baldly, have considerable wisdom in them if the background from which they spring be somewhat in mind.

1. Blessed is he who causes one educational institution to flourish where formerly two educational institutions languished.

2. He who measures the money and mechanics of a college on its campus, has an easier job than he who attempts to discover the value of the college output in terms of mind, character and spirit.

3. To understand the average student mind is to have fellowship with early and honest efforts to discover and deal with reality, though some bumptiousness be commingled therewith.

4. Blessed is the college president who may stay at home nights, in the town where his students are, rather than in a town where millionaires dwell.

5. A great teacher imparts life more than knowledge, for inspiration comes by compassion and contacts count for more than pedagogy.

6. A Ph.D. degree may signify no more than a dog license for a mongrel.

7. Research may mean an interest in a subject. Good teaching must mean interest in students.

8. A college which does not know whither it goes, does not go; nor does it know that, if it goes no-whither, it has begun to wither.

9. The purpose and passion of professors must pass through processes into the possession of pupils and become personal power in the pupils.

Perhaps this personifies pep and perseverance.—A. W. A.

JUST A FEW QUESTIONS CONCERNING A LIBERAL EDUCATION

What is a liberal education? Is the adjective, "liberal," used in an active, or a passive sense, or both, or perhaps neither?

It is easy to ask questions of a phrase as common and apparently as simple as that, which are very difficult to answer.

Has education been *liberated*?

It is compulsory; its courses are for the most part prescribed; some subjects are prohibited, and new restrictions are being imposed in different states; teachers cannot do as they wish; and certainly most pupils, particularly young ones, are permitted little, or no, choice.

Is education a *liberating* process?

It cannot liberate a feeble-minded youth from his limitations; it has not yet made a Negro lad as free as he would be, were he white; nor has it yet made a Jewish boy a social equal everywhere of the non-Jew; the probabilities are that the little boy on the steppes of Arabia will never break through, or over, the barriers which surrounded him at the time of his birth, however much he may be "educated." It is probable that Hanna Abu Khalil will remain Hanna Abu Khalil until the day of his death, although a grown-up Hanna, who will know more about camels and *jebels* and *wadis*.

And yet, illiberal as a liberal education may be, it is the most liberating influence in the world. It, if any thing, will liberate a child from the servitude of birth, into which he entered by no act of his.

Men know this everywhere, and, in consequence, are more generously disposed toward education and more jealously disposed toward education, than toward any other cause in the world.—A. W. A.

GREAT TEACHERS AND METHODS OF DEVELOPING THEM*

ROBERT L. KELLY

The executive and administrative officers of colleges affiliated with nineteen church boards of education were asked to cooperate in a study of two phases of college teaching.

The first phase had to do with those individuals referred to on any college campus as "great teachers." It is a rare college that has not had or does not have some "great teachers." The second phase was concerned with the methods used by the college officers in the building of their faculties. No effort has been made as yet to trace the possible relationships between these two phases of the subject.

A total of 187 colleges participated in the investigation regarding the great teachers, and a total of 162 in the study of the methods of building college faculties. Probably 200 colleges were concerned in both studies. Of this number something less than one-third are listed by the Association of American Universities, and a majority of the others are approved by the various regional associations. The purpose, however, was to secure the attitude toward the questions involved of those institutions which are affiliated with the church boards of education which compose the Council of Church Boards of Education and which therefore are definitely committed to what is called Christian education.

It is not claimed that the pictures secured are composite pictures of all American colleges, nor ideal pictures for the colleges cooperating. The camera was pointed to portions of the field and the results secured were the results secured. The data assembled disclose some unexpected results.

I. "GREAT TEACHERS"

It was doubted whether there was really general agreement as to who were the college's "great teachers," and the

* Report presented at a joint session of the Council and educational associations, Chattanooga, January 11, 1929. For detailed tabulations, and further discussion by Drs. G. E. Snively, R. E. Tulloss and C. H. Judd, see Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, March, 1929.

college officials were asked to indicate who they were—members of the administration, the faculty, the students, or the alumni—that looked upon these mythical or real persons as properly singled out for such academic distinction. Of more than 160 replies, all of which seemed to recognize the species, about 70 per cent reported that they were estimated as “great teachers” by all four classes of the college membership—administration, faculty, students and alumni. There were more than 20 per cent of the replies, indicating as many colleges, in which these prophets were not without honor among everybody except their colleagues. The teachers so isolated for honors were more frequently placed on pedagogical pedestals by various combinations of the other three college membership units than by a combination that included the faculty.

The original plan of the study was to test out with a degree of completeness the other groups of college representatives, namely, the faculties, the students and the alumni with the same schedules. This has been done partly and the results have been tabulated, although they do not appear in this presentation. However, it was discovered that the task was so formidable that it could not be accomplished adequately, at least at present.

There was a hypothesis that the so-called “great teacher” was largely a fabrication of the imagination. That the great teachers were neither born great nor achieved greatness, but that their greatness was thrust upon them by the administration for publicity purposes, or by alumni in their moments of sentimental reminiscence, and that the greatness of the teachers increased directly as the distance from the students’ graduation dates. One of the most eminent college presidents in our Association wrote: “I do not think the data which would result from this inquiry would be of any real value. The men named in most cases would be definitely men of the old-fashioned type; few, if any, would be Ph.D.’s; few, if any, would have had educational training. Their success in their day and gen-

eration would not indicate at all that the same combination of characteristics would achieve a corresponding success today."

Our findings indicate that it is not safe to prejudge an investigation. A few great teachers were reported for the decades of the nineteenth century—even so far back as 1841-50. But there were many more reported for the twentieth century than the nineteenth; there were more reported for the decade 1911-20 than for any other. The numbers for 1901-1910 exceeded the numbers for 1891-1900, and these in turn exceeded those for 1881-1890. Of course, the results might have been different if the reporting officers had been the alumni rather than the administrative officers. Perhaps the opinion of the officers of administration should be more reliable than that of the alumni. In any event, it appears that not all great teachers are dead teachers. The reports bear out the assertion of one of our correspondents that the great teachers are well distributed throughout the history of the college.

Among the teachers under consideration in these colleges it was found that 142 of them had the Doctor's degree. Within this list are included a few with Sc.D., Ped.D. and M.D. degrees. Also, the same number were reported as having the M.A. or M.S. degree. As to the universities from which these degrees were secured, Chicago is named more than any other one institution, followed very closely by Columbia, and after that, in order, by Cornell, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Yale, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and others, to the total of forty-one different institutions.

More great teachers, 68, were reported in the field of English and English literature than in any other field; mathematics ranks next, 57, followed by philosophy, 44; Greek, 42; Latin, 40; history, 36; biology, 30; chemistry, 29; Bible, 24; science, 20; education, 17; social science, 13; German, 12, and psychology, 12. If to what is reported definitely as "social science" were added economics, sociology, political science and government, the total would

equal that of history, 36, and if history and social science, thus broadly conceived, were combined, this group would take the first place. If to Bible were added religion, New Testament, theology and other kindred subjects this group would be in the same rank as history, 36. Forty-five different subjects were mentioned in which these teachers achieved distinction. As one correspondent remarked, "It is not a matter of subjects, but of teachers."

In view of the popular impression that "the great teacher" in student estimate at least is the easy mark, the question was asked: *Were some of their courses "snap" courses?* There were 159 answers to the question, 132 of which were in the negative and 17 in the affirmative. This decided landslide upward will take most people unawares.

The prediction turned out to be true that most of these teachers had not had training in a school of education. There were 110 negative answers to the question, 23 positive answers, and with 28 the answers were somewhat ambiguous. In the last group were listed replies involving both positive and negative answers.

In view of the often repeated declaration that there is better teaching in the high school than in the college, the question was put: *Have they had high school teaching experience?* The answers broke about even. Forty-four said positively "Yes;" 62 "No," and there were 51 of a miscellaneous character, indicating that some did and some did not.

In view of popular criticism one of the surprises came in the matter of research. Only 45 answers out of 158 were positively to the effect that their teachers were not also carrying on research as well as teaching. There were 69 positive answers in the affirmative, and a certain amount of ambiguity in 44. Sixty-five of our correspondents advised that the research had resulted in publication, though, of course, the type of publication was not stipulated. At least there was no disposition on the part of 40 per cent of our correspondents to ignore research as an important feature of successful teaching.

A considerably larger number of replies, 94, indicated that fruitful student contacts were more often to be found than publication as a result of the researches the teacher had made. Approximately 85 per cent of those who engaged in research were noted for their fruitful student contacts.

As a further effort to elicit judgments concerning the real teaching capacity of these men and women, the question was asked: *Did they teach their subjects, or did they devote much of their time in class to a discussion of questions of philosophical interest, or relating to the "problems of life?"* Of the 161 answers, 68 reported the teaching of the subjects, including "mainly" and "primarily," while 62 others reported that they taught both the subject and general questions of philosophical interest. Only six answers indicated essential discursiveness on the part of the teachers. Practically all the answers indicated a broad sympathy with life and with the institutions of life on the part of the teachers. Apparently, these teachers were not simply technicians. One correspondent remarked: "Great teachers never separate these two items."

As another indication of their breadth of interest and sympathy were the answers to the question: *Did they relate their subjects to the other subjects in the curriculum?* Only eight answered "No;" 122 "Yes." Twenty-three other answers indicated an intermediary position.

A still further effort was made to provoke a discriminating judgment by the question: *Were they "great" on account of their personality and character regardless of skill in teaching?* Seventy-three correspondents felt that their personality, character, etc., largely carried them through to distinction, and 29 believed that both were essential factors in the case. Only 26 answered in the negative. Very few cared to estimate the teacher purely on the basis of skill in teaching alone.

Only three of the executives report great teachers who did not have a positive religious influence. One hundred and thirty-eight answered unequivocally "Yes." There

were 19 whose answers were divided among different teachers.

Our correspondents went further and indicated the terms in which the positive religious influence was measured by them. Eighty of them referred to the effect upon students and on college life, and to the effect upon alumni in later life of the example, character, ideals, class attitudes, teaching, personal contacts, etc., while 27 placed emphasis upon church relationships, attendance at chapel, activity in the Y. M. C. A. and other organizations of this sort. Eighteen based their replies upon the testimony of students, alumni, citizens and general opinion; half as many others by the influence upon the vocational choice of students.

As to the question, *Were they distinguished scholars?* there was about an even break, 63 positively "Yes"; 69 positively "No," and 28 divided between different teachers.

In answer to the question, *To what extent did these teachers stimulate the students to frequent the library?* 67 said "constant use," "large extent," "greatly," "to a marked degree," etc. Nineteen replied, "considerably," "some," "to a considerable extent," etc. That our correspondents with few exceptions consider this a true test of a good teacher is evident from the almost universally favorable testimony.

To the question, *To what extent did their students go on for graduate work or professional study?* 147 answers were given. Seven reported "not particularly," "limited," "to a slight extent," etc. Four reported "average," "fair number," etc. Forty-one answered in terms of "many," "large per cent," "very largely," etc.; 36 said "to a considerable extent," "good number," "good per cent," "above average," etc. Fourteen replied in terms of definite per cents which range from 5 to 80 or more.

When it came to the qualities, attitudes and methods that were given the highest rating, 34 were unable to reply. Of the 128 who attempted an estimate, the following qualities or traits led: interest in students, knowledge or mastery of subject, personality, and character. Forty-three other

traits were mentioned from eleven to two times, and sixty-four others once each. Probably many of these could be classified under those first listed. Since, however, there is no general agreement as to what traits make up personality or character the matter must be left at present largely as it stands.

As to methods, one correspondent said: "Great teachers are superior to method," while others mentioned clear presentation, class discussion, questions, socialized recitation, research, concise assignments, not to limit amount of student preparation, inspirational lectures, etc.

II—FACULTY BUILDING

The second inquiry was couched in terms of the methods in vogue by the college authorities in building their faculties.

To the question, *What are you doing to enlist your own best students for college teaching?* there was almost universal response. Only 16 colleges admitted that they are pursuing a *laissez-faire* policy. There were over forty different varieties of answers, no one of which represented half of the colleges. Seventy-three colleges pin their faith or part of their faith to the graduate schools. Of this number 61 encourage their promising students to go on for graduate work and 12 aid them in securing fellowships or scholarships for that purpose. Twenty-eight of them report forms of "personal evangelism" in the interest of the cause—direct conferences, or other individual efforts carried on by the president, dean, major advisers, heads of departments, and other faculty members. Twenty-two profess to utilize their own courses in education as a means of promoting the profession on a college level. Only 15 of the colleges report the use of assistantships and instructorships as a means of developing professional personnel, and only eight mention various forms of vocational advice. One college reports its effort to guide students in self-discovery.

Among the other means mentioned are a scholarship recognition service held semi-annually, an annual confer-

ence with the Dean of the Graduate School, the stimulation of interest through an educational fraternity, the maintenance of personal contacts with former students doing work in graduate schools, and reliance upon the zeal of teachers to reproduce their kind. One college pays a minimum of \$2,000 per year to instructors, while another advises that the atmospheric condition of the institution is surcharged with the educational spirit and many teachers are sent out.

In the effort to come a little more closely to grips with the problem in hand, the question was asked: *To what extent are you developing your faculty (a) from your own students? (b) From your own staff?*

(a) The methods of developing the faculty from the students are considered first.

Per cent of Faculty who are Alumni	Number of Institutions
10 or less	17
11-20	15
21-30	16
31-40	7
41-50	6
51-60	2
75	1

Only two colleges definitely state that they have no policy in this matter, and one of these said "No plan yet developed." A few colleges state their fear of inbreeding, but for the most part this fear results only in the limitation of the number of their own students on the faculty. To this question there were approximately fifty different kinds of answers. Fifty-four colleges gave per cents or figures from which per cents could be computed.

Nineteen others reported definitely numbers, ranging from one to eight, of alumni on the faculty. Seventeen employed such terms as "largely," "a majority," "several," "fair proportion," "normal proportion" in answering this question.

(b) From your own staff?

Seventy-nine colleges either made no answer or made answers meaningless to the tabulator. If this means that 79 colleges are not vitally concerned with the development of their own staff it indicates an appalling situation. Some of the data to be presented later may be interpreted as indicating that in the estimation of many of the colleges under consideration the election to a professorship registers the end of the concern of the college in the man's professional development. The range of those answers which indicate an attempt at constructive measures is much narrower than in the two questions preceding and yet most of these answers are ambiguous or evasive. A few colleges admit they are more interested in the young men whom they may secure than in the men they already have. A few colleges report in terms of ratios a definite policy of developing their faculties from their staff: 1-4 per cent, 1-25 per cent, 1-33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent, 3-50 per cent. There are a few specific methods of promotion given. Five colleges speak of concrete plans of procedure which are here inserted:

Each summer we allot \$200 each to five teachers, to enable them to spend not less than six weeks in some university in this country or abroad studying in the department in which they are serving the college. Also we appropriate \$500 each summer to each of two teachers for the purpose of summer travel.

We encourage sabbatical leave and possibly a semester's leave with salary for promising young teachers, who need more graduate work.

For those holding the Doctor's degree we allow a maximum of \$300 for summer work in good universities.

We have a definite purpose to keep one instructor in graduate school on half salary each year; three instructors on full salary for summer study, and one professor on honorarium of \$150 for study each summer.

The college appropriates for graduate study \$200 each (in summer session) for five of our best teachers.

The infrequency of references to sabbatic leave is the most amazing feature of this part of the investigation. Only 56 colleges mentioned their efforts to encourage graduate study in summer terms, by leaves of absence, and sabbatical leaves, and of this number only 16 gave assurance that these leaves were with financial aid.

Almost every college answered Question 3: *How long have you kept your best teachers? Explain.* The actual length of time ranges from one to sixty-three years, with the average minimum and maximum terms of service being respectively twelve and twenty-eight years. There were 145 attempted explanations for the tenure of service. Many of the institutions seem to consider length of service in itself a virtue. The explanations are couched in such language as to raise some doubts. "Best teachers seem to consider themselves fixtures and are not much inclined to leave." "Not a marked disposition of teachers of college to make changes." "Few leave who become established." "Believe in long tenure." "Some are being retained with a view to long tenure." There is a remarkable number of professors who have held their positions ten, twenty, thirty, forty and even fifty years. One wonders if the long tenure illustrates the law of inertia.

On the other hand, there are indications that long tenure is bought with a price for service actually rendered to the institution. "Usually able to hold the ones we consider most desirable." "Do not expect to lose good teachers." "The best have built themselves into the institution." "Match offers received by strong teachers." "It is our purpose to render them any assistance we can if they are worthy of promotion, and if we cannot care for them within the organization we will certainly help them to gain what is their due somewhere else."

The time has certainly come for challenging long tenure for the sake of long tenure. Two or three colleges reported that some of their best men stayed only a few years, but not a single college announced the policy of securing young teachers of exceptional parts with the expectation in ad-

vance that they could not keep them very long but with the hope and belief that a short stay by them might surcharge the faculty for a generation.

Have you found it especially advantageous for college teachers to have had high school experience?

All but seven of the colleges answered this question. Seventy-eight of our correspondents answered an unequivocal, "Yes," and 63 an equally unequivocal, "No." Evidently a large majority, therefore, do not at present attach particular significance to this consideration. If it is true, as is often claimed, that the teaching in the high schools is superior to that in the colleges, this superiority has not sufficiently impressed these colleges as to impel them to seek instructors with high school experience. No doubt the officials of junior colleges would answer the question differently.

A really surprising result is registered in the answers to the question, *Do you prefer to have college teachers with educational training?* One hundred and eighty-five of the 187 colleges answered, and 117 gave an unequivocal, "Yes." Twenty more answered equivocally, "Yes." But 22 answered unequivocally, "No," and three equivocally, "No."

What proportion of your teachers are "college-minded" rather than "department-minded?"

A distinguished college president declined to answer the question on the ground that "No one under heaven could answer such an inquiry. A long discussion as to the meaning of the term 'college-minded' must precede any answer and no committee would agree on the exact proportion." There were only five others, however, who declared themselves unable to answer the question, and 10 who ignored the inquiry. To the officers of 110 colleges this evidently is a question with a significant meaning since they undertake to state their replies in terms of ratios which are set forth for what they are worth in the following tabulation.

Here we have a definite recognition of faculty men who are able to look over the fence, which is at variance with the common verdict that colleges in general are too rigidly

Per cent of Teachers "College-minded"	Number of Institutions
25 or less	17
26-50	34
51-75	25
76-100	34

departmentalized. The inference seems to be that in many faculties students are being taught as well as subjects. One college president believes that probably most of his best teachers have the general interest of the college in mind as much as department interest.

In the opinion of several administrators the younger members of the faculty still under the influence of the graduate schools are more likely to be department-minded than those with longer records in college teaching.

The seventh question had to do with criteria of promotion. *Do you promote teachers on the basis of (a) good teaching? (b) Of research and publication?*

Only six colleges failed to answer section (a) of the question, while 34 failed to answer section (b). One hundred and eight profess to promote—primarily, of course, it is understood—on the basis of good teaching and seven primarily on the basis of research. Two report that they do not promote on the basis of good teaching, one of them adding, "but we should," while 57 do not promote on the basis of research and publication. Forty-six promote on both bases and two on neither. It is evident, therefore, that the colleges in question hold general agreement with a group of research men, representing the leading learned societies of the country, recently in session at Washington, who without exception asserted that their own best college teachers were of the inspirational sort (whom they named) and not at all or necessarily men engaged either in research or publication.

To give an air of scientific completeness to this summary we should add that one executive gave the rather startling

information, "Do not promote on any basis," while another answered, "Practically no promotion."

The eighth question was, *From what graduate schools do you get your best teachers?*

One hundred and thirty-three institutions were named as sources of "best teachers." As several of those specified are not graduate schools, there are no doubt a number of "best teachers" who did no graduate work. On the basis of the frequency with which they were named the leading universities rank: University of Chicago 93, Columbia 70, Harvard 44, Johns Hopkins 29, Cornell 25, Illinois 25, Yale 25, Iowa 23, Wisconsin 20, Michigan 18, Princeton 16, Pennsylvania 14, Northwestern 13, Ohio State 10.

The investigation was carried further by means of the inquiry: *What special departments in what graduate schools?* To this question 71 institutions made specific reply, some of the outstanding summaries of which are set forth in the accompanying table.

DEPARTMENTS OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS NAMED FIVE TIMES
OR MORE

Department	Institutions					
	Chicago	Columbia	Harvard	Johns Hopkins	Illinois	Wisconsin
Education	10	17	—	—	—	—
History	11	7	—	—	—	—
English	10	8	9	—	—	—
Social Science*	10	—	—	—	—	—
Ancient Languages	9	—	—	—	—	—
Modern Languages	9	7	—	—	—	—
Mathematics	6	—	—	—	—	—
Science**	6	—	—	—	—	—
Chemistry	—	—	—	5	5	5
Biology	5	—	—	—	—	—

* Does not include economics and sociology, etc., when such subjects are named separately.

** When the various sciences are listed separately, they are so tabulated and not included in "Science."

As a special effort to evaluate this particular approach to the reliance upon the graduate schools, the question was asked: *Are your present faculty members from these same graduate schools? From these departments?* The answers verified the belief that prompted the question, namely, that faculty members rather naturally seek recruits from their own universities and departments. A good majority answered in the affirmative as to the graduate schools and about half as many as to the departments.

It is not claimed by the writer that this is a "scientific" study. Incidentally, it is his belief that many so-called "scientific" studies in the educational field fall short of the expectations aroused by the claims made for them. In this particular study the method pursued was that of questionnaires or schedules. Any study with this technique alone falls far short of being scientific. This method was resorted to because in this preliminary study there seemed to be no other way possible.

The questions were addressed to executive and administrative officers who are absorbed in many phases of college administration, and many of whom have not been professionally trained for the interpretation of teaching methods or programs. In the nature of the case, these college officials in case of doubt would wish to give preferential treatment to their own institutions and their own teachers. This is not to say that our correspondents are not sincere and honest men, but it is to say that they are pressed on many sides with many duties and no doubt the answers to the questions were not given as detailed study in some cases as the serious objectives of the investigation might require.

Furthermore, in the absence of definite definitions and prescriptions it could not be claimed that there was universal or even general agreement as to the significance of the questions asked.

Again, there are in the replies numerous subjective judgments as well as occasional efforts at objective measurement. So long as both these types of measurement are involved in a single study the results could not be referred to as strictly

scientific. Dewey has remarked that the enterprise in which we are engaged is "the most complex, intricate and subtle of human enterprises." It is perfectly evident that the teachers here reported upon as great teachers excelled in the *art* of teaching, not the *science* of teaching.

It is generally recognized that genetics is an exact science. Perhaps it is true that the outstanding development in science during the last twenty-five years has been the development of genetics. As East says in his *Heredity and Human Affairs*, "Genetics was born and christened because of Gregor Mendel, not because he was such an intellectual giant that he could analyze and codify the complex results which had baffled his predecessors in hybridization work, but because he had the really brilliant idea of simplifying his experiments to the point where he was dealing with only one or two variables at a time. When heretofore botanists had crossed plants differing by hundreds of characters and had been bewildered at the apparent chaos of their data, Mendel used varieties which differed by a single striking character. This lone character he followed through generation after generation with the care of a master workman, obtaining results so simple that he was able to give them their correct interpretation." As appears from the study here presented, there are in some cases twenty, thirty, even sixty different types of approved teaching characteristics and it will be many a day before the thorough scientific method of Gregor Mendel can be applied to the problems here discussed.

At the same time the replies which have been received from this group of college officials indicate—roughly, it may be, as is inevitable in a pioneer study—certain dominant tendencies both in their estimation of the qualities and traits of a great teacher and in their description of the administration's method of constructing a faculty. The report presented is a picture, if not accurately of the great teachers and of the methods of constructing faculties, at least of the mental processes of a more or less highly differentiated group of our educational workers. If it does

not indicate the type of teacher they ought to have, it at least indicates the type of teacher they think they have and it indicates frankly the excellences as well as the deficiencies of their present methods of faculty building.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. It appears that the so-called great teacher has been found throughout the entire history of our denominational colleges, but that contrary to the prophecies frequently made, more of them have appeared in the twentieth century than in the nineteenth century. The decade in which the largest number of great teachers was listed was the decade ending 1920.

2. It appears that the great teachers have taught the great subjects, the subjects which have always—or, at least, since the rise of science—taken the prominent place in the college curriculum, although there is evidence that the question after all is not a question of subjects but of teachers.

3. It appears that in the judgment of our correspondents it has not been the teachers who made their work easy or popular who have been considered the great teachers, but rather those who have inspired their students to greater individual effort.

4. It appears that a considerable majority of these teachers have not been trained in education, but along with this finding must be considered the fact that a good majority of the college officials are now giving preferential treatment to those who have had training in education.

5. The assumption that the teachers in these colleges have not been men of modern training does not stand as indicated by the findings of this study.

6. It appears that the attitude of these college officials is decidedly not one of antagonism to research. It would, of course, be hazardous to agree that everything reported as research would meet the requirements of a scientific definition, but it is not only interesting but illuminating to observe that a very large proportion of the colleges insist

that their great teachers have had at least the research attitude of mind. At the same time there is a very decided opinion among them that the traits which lead to successful research are different from the traits which lead to successful teaching, and there is a very strong trend in the direction of giving first consideration in the employment of teachers in these colleges to the capacity to teach. It is claimed by our correspondents that the men who have been engaged in so-called research have been more distinguished for their fruitful contacts with students than for their publications.

7. These college executives do not believe that teachers have been listed as great because of their diffused interest in the problems of life in general. They report that a few of them have been essentially discursive in their thinking and methods, but that the overwhelming majority of them, while showing broad sympathies with life and with the institutions of life, have nevertheless held closely to the teaching of their subjects.

8. It also appears that very few of the great teachers are estimated purely on the basis of their pedagogical technique. With their skill in teaching have usually gone distinct characteristics of personality, character and definite religious influence. (See page 420.)

9. The answers to the question as to whether they were distinguished scholars, undoubtedly need careful interpretation, and the data at present are insufficient for this interpretation.

10. There was a very general expression on the part of our correspondents that the teachers under consideration were noted for their success in stimulating students to frequent the libraries. The testimony on this point is almost universally favorable.

11. The consensus of opinion is very conclusive that these teachers stimulated their students to further study in the graduate schools and elsewhere.

12. The personal qualities or traits of the great teachers are, in order,—interest in the students, knowledge or

mastery of the subject, sympathy, helpfulness, character and personality.

13. In the matter of building faculties, it appears that nearly all of these colleges profess to have some sort of a technique. More of them rely upon the graduate schools than upon any other agency of employment. This opens up a subject into which this study does not go. The writer believes that on this point the colleges did not do themselves justice. They made no reference to the methods by which the institutions are assisting in the development of professional study while in service. No reference was made to exchange professors or to the fact that large numbers of colleges subscribe regularly for professional periodicals for the use of members of their faculties. There are scores of colleges which take from ten to sixty copies of the Association of American Colleges BULLETIN for the use of their teachers.

It is surprising that so few colleges make any reference to their agencies of personnel, and that only one college reports its effort to guide students in self-discovery. Evidently, in these institutions, personnel work has not been coordinated with their teaching processes.

14. There seems to be a strong sentiment that length of service of a faculty member is in itself a virtue, and there is little indication that the methods which are used in some of the great phases of big business, where a highly capable man is frequently shifted from one place to another in the service in order that he may be kept ever alert, are in use. It will be recalled that in not a few of our American colleges, great teachers have not taught the subject in which they specialized for their Ph. D. degree. William Rainey Harper was a conspicuous illustration and the names of numerous others will come to mind. A great business concern which employs engineers has recently been referred to which refuses to assign a man to an engineering job in the field in which he specialized. If he is an electrical engineer they give him a job in mechanical engineering; if he is a civil engineer they assign him a task in which elec-

trical engineering plays an important part; they thereby try to keep their men everlastingly on their toes. The custom found in industry to "switch" the dependable men to new but kindred lines, to prevent them from getting into ruts or becoming too much localized is not reported here. There is no doubt but that long tenure for the sake of long tenure is destined soon to receive a searching challenge.

15. There is a growing disposition to recognize that *teaching* counts and to promote teachers on the basis of good teaching as the major consideration.

16. The facts are brought out very clearly as to what graduate schools are now making the greatest contribution of teachers to these colleges. Under this head the statement should be made that the Graduate School of Duke University alone, which is yet in the process of organization, reports a definite plan for the developing along professional lines of students who show aptitude or interest in the teaching profession. This may be prophetic of one of the next great steps of graduate education in this country.

17. THERE WAS A MORE NEARLY UNANIMOUS TESTIMONY ON THE BASIS OF THE PERCENTAGE OF REPLIES RECEIVED THAT GREAT TEACHERS HAVE POSITIVE RELIGIOUS INFLUENCE THAN IN ANY OTHER ITEM OF APPRAISAL.

Dr. Charles R. Mann put this characteristic of the great teacher in these words: "He fosters religious faith."

In the last *Faculty News Letter* published by Park College there is extensive quotation from the Association of American Colleges *Bulletin* and reference to the program of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting. Supplementing the Chattanooga papers, are a valuable discussion of "Defects and Difficulties in College Teaching," by C. C. Crawford, of the University of Southern California, and a summary of the tentative findings of the American Council of Education on the topic, "What Does a College Teacher Do?"

DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL
INSTRUCTORS, EDITED BY ISMAR J. PERITZ, PROFESSOR OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

QUALIFYING AS BIBLICAL INSTRUCTOR

In the present issue of *CHRISTIAN EDUCATION* consideration is given to the function of the teacher of religion. It suggests some phases of the Biblical material on the subject.

The apostolic church held the office of teacher in highest esteem, ranking it next to the apostles and prophets. Thus Paul declares (I Cor. 12: 28) that "God hath set in the church first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers. . . ." But in proportion as the function of the apostles and prophets declined and passed away that of the teacher became more influential. This esteem of the teacher was an inheritance from the Jewish church which carried it to an extreme. So Mishnah, Aboth (4: 12), "Let the honor of thy disciple be as dear to you as thine own; and the honor of thy colleague as the reverence for thy teacher; and the reverence for thy teacher as thy reverence for God." It is most probably due to this exaggeration that the warning was given (Mt. 28: 8), "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your teacher." Modesty, accordingly, well becomes the teacher; and it is not incompatible with the consciousness of great responsibility.

When Paul makes his defence before an infuriated people and exclaims "I was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel," it was more than a mere rhetorical reminiscence. It was the expression of the just pride of a great scholar in having had a great teacher, and equivalent to saying, "I am a Harvard man." Gamaliel the Elder was the grandson of Hillel, and what little we know of him justifies Paul's pride.

We well know that the time has passed when teachers can claim respect merely on external grounds. We must personally back up our noblest ideals. But who is sufficient for these things? When however it can be done, it sometimes has its unexpected rewards as, for instance, when President Hoover graciously as-

signs a place of high honor at his inauguration to his former teacher, Mrs. Mollie Carran, reflecting credit on both himself and his teacher.—*I. J. P.*

THE GROWING TEACHER*

W. R. CULLOM, Wake Forest College

The most important asset that any one can carry into a classroom is *personality*. It is the overflow of personality that is involved in a recent definition of education, *viz.*: "That which is left when one forgets all that he has learned." As we look across the years and think of the teachers who have made the largest and most meaningful contribution to our lives, which are they? Do we think of those whose subject matter lingers with us or do we think of those whose personal character was stamped upon us? To ask this question is surely to answer it. My contention is that the task of growing a personality is the most important of all the tasks that confront a teacher. Nor is there any limit in time or space to such development. When after many years of publishing a sermon a week that grew out of his Bible study, Charles H. Spurgeon made a little estimate of his attainment in his particular field, he declared that he had not touched the border of the garment. When the same man thought of the greatness of his God and of the infinite adequacy of the Gospel of His love and grace he was made to wonder whether he might not be privileged at some time to preach to planets instead of individuals. Spurgeon might not have possessed such technical scholarship as did Alexander Maclaren, but his personality was marked by a constancy, a persistence and enthusiasm in growth that made him one of the really great teaching forces of the nineteenth century. John A. Broadus lived half a decade beyond his allotted three-score-and-ten. His scholarship and his beautiful character grew apace through all those years. With all the immediate practical help he gave his stu-

* A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Section of the National Association of Biblical Instructors, Chattanooga, Tenn., January 8, 1929.

dents (and this phase of his work cannot be measured) the greatest thing by far that he did for them was the impartation of his own personality. The making of this personality was the result of a painstaking, life-long adherence to the laws of growth.

These words "the laws of growth" suggest that the task of becoming a growing teacher is not a matter of haphazard. It is not to be had for the mere asking. It can come only as a result of following from year to year certain principles of life that are as simple as they are essential. It will not be my purpose to discuss these principles, but only to mention and emphasize one or two of the more cardinal ones. And may I remind you, to begin with, that growth *must proceed from the inside*. This means of course that the growing teacher must begin with himself, and continue patiently and persistently to work with himself throughout life. It was a great day in the history of education when men began to think of education as a life process rather than as a matter of completing a given curriculum. Nor is the process confined to any particular part of one's make-up. Some would emphasize the intellectual to the practical exclusion of the emotional and the volitional. The lamented Professor Benjamin Kidd has made a most valuable suggestion in his book, *The Science of Power*, as to the place of the emotions in education.

The change also of our conception of the universe as a fixed, rigid crystallized mass to that of a world that is yet plastic and in process of becoming, compels us to feel that life is a constant series of adjustments. The teacher *must* grow or become a fossil before he knows it.

The necessity for growth is also emphasized when we take into consideration the unity of the whole world, and the consequent interrelation of all subjects. It was my privilege to attend the annual session of the National Association of Biblical Instructors at Union Theological Seminary, New York, a few weeks ago. Half the topics discussed at that meeting had to do with the relationship between the Bible and other curriculum subjects. Some of the particular ones discussed in this meeting were: "The Relation of the Bible to Courses in History," "The Correlation of Courses in the Bible and Philosophy," "The Bearing of Archaeology on the Bible." The same suggestion might have

been offered as to the relation between the Bible and sociology, the Bible and the various physical sciences, the Bible and general literature, etc., through the whole curriculum. Of course no man can be a specialist in all these fields. It is hard to be a specialist in the whole of one's own field, much less in the various fields with which his subject may be affiliated. At the same time, it is imperatively necessary that the teacher be sufficiently acquainted in all these fields to present his material as a sympathetic unit in the great temple of learning. To do this, he must continue to grow in his apprehension of and in his intelligent sympathy with every subject handled by his colleagues and, also, with the life currents of his own generation.

In thinking of the necessity of perpetual growth on the part of the teacher and of how this growth must take in the *whole* man, it has seemed to me that we need a new word—a word that will be sufficiently elastic and comprehensive to include the response of the whole personality—intellect, feeling, and will, at the same time. At this point I am reminded of a feeling that often comes to me in my work, *viz.*: that we should have in our language the verb "*to faith*." The noun in the New Testament answers admirably. The Greatest of all Teachers said: "According to your *faith*, be it unto you." Faith here includes more than intellect, more than feeling, more than will. Does it not include all that can be put into all of them together? The greatest of all the interpreters of this Greatest Teacher, has himself, also, given to us a most instructive use of the word "*faith*." In Romans I: 17 he describes the process of development in the righteousness of the New Testament as being "from faith to faith." "Out of faith into faith." And this goes on indefinitely—probably through all eternity. If this interpretation of faith has anything to it, what a blessing it would be to us to be able to speak of "*faithing*" the great questions of life! Be that as it may, the growth that we are insisting on here is a growth that involves the response of the *whole* man to the challenge of God's unfolding world about him. The man who is doing this constantly can never grow old, or dry, or uninteresting to those who may touch him at any time or in any way. His own joy and zest in life, moreover, will grow apace with the years!

If you would ask for specific suggestions as to growth I would offer to you two. They are these:

1. Be much alone.
2. Be much in the fellowship of others.

As to the first, did not that Greatest Teacher say to his special friends whose growth was much on his mind and heart: "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." I wonder if he did not mean by the word "pray" here all that has been suggested in connection with the word *faith* in the above discussion? It has been my privilege recently to go through most of Count Keyserling's *The Travel Diary of a Philosopher*. Certainly no one would accuse the Count of being a Christian in the traditional sense of that term, and yet his counsel with reference to the use of the secret place might well remind one of the counsel of Jesus. The personality that would drink deep of the FOUNTAIN of life must learn to abide in the secret place of the MOST HIGH.

On the other hand it is equally important that the teacher should cultivate fellowship with other men, if he would develop a personality that is symmetrical, rich in human sympathy, and prepared to see life and see it whole. This fellowship can be cultivated first of all in one's own immediate surroundings. The teacher should be the personal friend of all those about him—the poor, the ignorant, the unfortunate and especially of little children, as well as those in his own class. He should also cultivate men of various callings and professions, men in all the walks of life. Of course, the teacher will also take advantage of every opportunity of attending conferences where the major issues of life are faced and discussed by men and women who are prepared to share these vital things in a helpful way. One cannot afford, to be sure, to be running about over the country all the time, but time taken from the classroom or from a holiday sufficient to keep one in touch with what his fellows are thinking and doing in their respective fields will yield a fruitage in the way of general growth, in giving perspective, and in direct help for the immediate task in hand, that will more than compensate for the expen-

diture of time and money involved. And then, there is the summer quarter in our universities where special courses are put on with a view to helping the teacher into an immediate and first-hand view of the very best that can be had in any one of the many fields that may concern him. And, in thinking of this matter of cultivating fellowship with others, what shall be said as to travel, at home and abroad? When some rich person shall ask advice from me as to how to spend a little money where it will really count, I am going to suggest that he select a group of teachers from each state in the Union each year and send them abroad under competent leadership. What a reaction for good would come at once into the classrooms of the schools involved in such a venture! What a vast amount of intelligent, international sympathy would be developed in the shortest possible time! It is gratifying to know that many of our schools are not waiting for some one else to do this for them, but are themselves making provision for one or more of their teachers to go abroad for travel and study each summer. May the ability and inclination of this sort of thing on the part of the trustees of our schools increase. I would, also, urge on the trustees of our schools the importance of providing the sabbatic year for their teachers that they may have time for study and for writing down for the benefit of others the result of their study.

In the meantime, however, those of us who teach must not wait upon the action of others. We must learn to find joy in our regular routine and so to relate ourselves to our daily task as to bring into our lives the richest that can be gathered from the best that is going on about us. When we shall come to feel as the MASTER did that it is our meat and drink to do the task committed to us, we shall find some of the best possible means of growth tied up in the details of our sacred task.

Mr. H. T. Stock, the Secretary of the Student and Young People's Department of the Congregational Education Society, is issuing a Newsletter for workers among students, which is exceedingly stimulating. We are taking the liberty of reproducing some of his pages in current issues of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

THE COLLEGE TEACHER OF RELIGION

An Abstract

WALLACE N. STEARNS, Illinois Woman's College

The function of the teacher of religion is different from that of any other member of the college faculty. He must, of course, be representative of what is finest and soundest in scholarship. His degrees should vouch for his training. Even at cost of sacrifice he must keep himself abreast of what the latest research or exploration has to offer. His bibliographies should keep his students in the way of sound learning. In no department does the mind of the student cross so many lines, enter so many fields, or discuss so many themes. Whoever follows where his subject leads, will be linguist, philologist, philosopher, historian, artist, exegete—in fact no man lives who can survey profitably for his students and his readers the entire field of Biblical study, to say nothing of numerous related branches.

The teacher of religion is more than this. He is face to face with a group of students who, through poor training or lack of training, are picking their way along a narrow highway with a ditch on either side. To mix figures, either they are utterly at sea in their beliefs or they have their mental furniture screwed so tight to the floor that any rearrangement spells ruin. The problem here is to help these people to orient or reorient themselves without mental disaster. To mispronounce a word is a grievous blunder; to misquote an author is a crime—but to put a kink in a student's thinking is to tamper with his eternal destiny. Often the teacher of religion must lay aside the steel-yards and become a sympathetic friend. Inexorable standards must sometimes wait; in training exceptional students, we must not leave too many wrecks behind us. Standards must be respected, but the teacher of religion is dealing, more than any other teacher, with flesh and blood, more than that, with immortal souls.

Students enter college with a youth's idea of science, literature, art, religion; too often they leave college with an adult's concep-

tion of everything but religion. Later, contrast seems all too evident and becomes odious.

Moreover, the teacher of religion must be an exponent of culture. There are writers in the Old and New Testaments who at times rise to periods of exaltation and grandeur, high points that are supreme. The teacher must know the way and guide his students therein. These books are books of life, hammered out in the smithy of men's souls. Only out of a wealth of personal experience can the wealth of these books be imparted. We might add here that this teacher should appreciate and revel in the out-of-doors. Jesus was an out-of-doors man; Paul experienced storm and sunshine, by land and sea; the Gospels are full of nature; the writers of Job knew nature in her loftiest moods; to the Prophets, and notably Amos, nature had nothing hidden which they did not discover; to the Psalmists there were two supreme themes, the law of God and His wonderful out-of-doors.

The teacher of religion should be an apostle of good cheer. A solemn demeanor might arise from dyspepsia or be due to poor circulation. Abounding good health, good sense, and good cheer—all go to make a man more companionable, and a better teacher.

The teacher of religion must be a philosopher, and by precept and by example of a correct life and of correct thinking teach the divine art of right living. Science can help a man to a living; philosophy helps him to live. A right outlook on life, an apprehension of its problems, the far vision, the serenity that comes with the ability to view life as would an interested spectator, to regard life's ups and downs as part of the great game, and to grapple with life's great problems—one with such experience may well lay claim to being educated, trained. Nothing else gets quite so close to the heart of the student as religion and philosophy, the great stabilizers of life.

As a consequence of our more or less cast-iron system of requirements, students spend a considerable portion of their time on subjects that in no way interest them. Accordingly textbooks and notebooks are dropped at the close of the final exam as though infested with plague: "I loathe the subject," "I

hate it," and like expressions. But the teacher of religion, though he find his pupils cold, must leave them at the end of the course interested, enthusiastic, and resolved to know more. Not only to get a living but also to live—this is the real goal! Religion as a discipline is as essential as science. There is no conflict between religion and science. There may be conflicts between medieval theology, and twentieth century science, and equally so vice versa. But no man whose mental and spiritual growth has been symmetrical ever need fall into a Slough of Despondency or be a prisoner to Giant Despair.

A CRITICISM

In *CHRISTIAN EDUCATION* for March, 1929, p. 374, occurs the following statement:

"It (Archaeology) has established the fact that the Roman census occurred every fourteen years, and that one census was taken in 20 A. D. The second census of Quirinius fell, accordingly, in 6 A. D., and the first census of Quirinius, at which time Jesus was born, fell in 8 B. C., unless perhaps, as Ramsey thinks, the census was delayed in Judea."

This statement contains an error that is not infrequently made by scholars who undertake to find the interval between A. D. and B. C. dates. To add the A. D. number and the B. C. number always gives one year more than the difference between the dates. From 8 B. C. to 6 A. D. is thirteen years, not fourteen.

This error can best be seen by asking how long a time elapsed between a specific date, say July 1, in 1 B. C. and the corresponding date in 1 A. D. Clearly only one year elapsed, but if we should add the B. C. and the A. D. numerals we should be led to believe that two years had elapsed.—*S. E. Stout, Indianapolis, Ind.*

One of the most radical movements in education is now in progress under the direction of Columbia University. New text books have been prepared by Dr. Harold Rugg and are endorsed by many educators, in which war is almost ignored. The World War receives attention to the extent of 1,700 words and the Civil War 2,000 words—with battle descriptions omitted. More than 300 school systems are already using the texts. What rage there will be among our militarists when they discover this movement!

THE PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1928

RALPH K. HICKOK, Wells College

Unfortunately, the writer did not read the splendid October, 1928, number of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION when first received. This was a violation of his ordinary practice, for usually the numbers are read as early as possible, and always with profit. The omission this time was doubly unfortunate; first, because the number was packed with things of more than common value—for example, the editorial on "The Bible its Own Interpreter," the review of Torrey's *Second Isaiah* by Professor Barton, and the reports of the church assemblies of the Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian (U. S. A.), and the Baptist Churches; and second, because in these reports of the church assemblies one or two things suggested themselves to his mind as worthy of further comment. It is hoped that the delay has not rendered the additional statements inopportune.

This note is concerned with the report of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U. S. A.) written by Professor William H. Wood, of Dartmouth College. It is noted that the reports of the Methodist and the Baptist gatherings were written by representatives of those communions. This policy was not followed in the case of the Presbyterian report, and this writer hastens to say that there is no criticism in his mind because of this fact. Surely a great deal might be said in favor of having such reports come from informed and sympathetic writers from other bodies than the one which is under discussion. In this case there can be no question as to the quality or the character of Professor Wood's discussion. His paper shows both knowledge and sympathy. It were well if there might be more instances of such real and accurate knowledge of the affairs of our several communions revealed by those who write from an outside point of view. The purpose of this note, therefore, is to add to what Professor Wood says, rather than to criticize or to correct.

The one point before the writer's mind is the all-important one of liberty of thought. This matter is of vital concern for all of us, whatever our church affiliation may chance to be. Is this freedom in danger in the Presbyterian Church?

It is somewhat hard for one outside this church to recognize that the General Assembly is definitely limited in its control of this vital matter. It is an annual body, whose personnel is completely changed from year to year. Its pronouncements always have weight, but it is clear that no single Assembly can ever do anything which can infringe upon the prophetic liberty of its individual ministers or teachers. In making this statement there is no wish to ignore the fact that there has been an element in the church for a number of years which has been attempting to use the deliverances of the Assemblies as means by which the ministers and teachers of the church might be held in check. This movement found expression in the Assemblies of 1910 and 1916, when five points of theological adherence were laid down as binding upon all Presbyterian teachers, and, more recently, in certain "complaints" against the Presbytery of New York when these aforesaid "deliverances" were cited as though they were binding upon the entire church. This whole attempt to magnify the powers of the General Assembly reached its climax at the Assembly in Columbus, Ohio, in 1925, when there were moments of peril from the viewpoint of those who loved the church and who desired freedom to serve the Kingdom of God from within the circle of the Presbyterian fellowship. The story is too complicated to be summarized here. Suffice it to say that the attempt failed. One may truly say that any Presbyterian minister or teacher has all the liberty for prophetic thinking and speaking which any member of any great body has a right to ask. There are constitutional ways by which he may be called to account for his utterances, but they do not lie within the province of any single General Assembly. This has been the historic attitude of the church, maintained strongly by such great conservative leaders as Drs. Charles Hodge and Francis Landey Patton. The attack upon it, referred to above, has been made and has been settled in accord with the historic principles of the church.

The 13th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, which appeared just about the time (1926) when the above-mentioned attempt to use the deliverance of the General Assembly as a means of limiting the freedom of Presbyterian teachers (in pulpit and school) was at its height, had an article on "Presbyter-

ianism" written by Dr. James Moffat. The article contained the following sentence: "Internally, the Presbyterian Church has suffered, like most of the other American churches, from the Fundamentalist controversy which is still raging; it is an effort to commit the church to five 'fundamental' points of theology, viz., (1) the inerrancy of the Bible; (2) the Virgin Birth; (3) the Atonement as a sacrifice; (4) the Resurrection of Christ 'with the same body with which He suffered'; and (5) the reality of the Lord's miracles."

This statement was accurate at that time, though, as already indicated, the outcome has been highly satisfactory. It may be that Dr. Moffat, who had not yet come to the United States to live, was influenced somewhat in his report by the fact that the General Assembly in Scotland has, as compared with the Presbyteries, relatively larger power than is true here.

It should be added that two groups in the church were responsible for the decisions reached; first, a group which is distinctly liberal and modern in its point of view; and second, a larger group which, whatever its individual members might believe as to these five points, was unwilling that they should be furthered by a method which was unconstitutional and which did violence to the historic practice of the church.

It is true, as Professor Wood rightly points out, that the Presbyterian Church is a conservative body. But it is also a body with strong constitutional convictions and these certainly tend to safeguard its ministers and teachers from isolated and sporadic attacks. Witness the presence within the church of such liberal thinkers as President Henry Sloane Coffin, among its teachers, and of Dr. William D. Merrill, among its pastors.

THE COLLEGES OF THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

FLOYD W. REEVES, The University of Kentucky

Fifteen states have institutions that are affiliated with the Board of Education of Disciples of Christ. Among these institutions are twenty colleges and universities; four foundations operating at state-supported institutions; two schools of religion affiliated with state universities; a school of Bible affiliated with Drury College, a Congregational institution; and a divinity house affiliated with The University of Chicago.

Recently a comprehensive survey of these institutions was made by the writer for the Board of Education. This survey was begun in 1924, and completed in 1928. A general report of the survey was made to the Board of Education early in 1928. In addition, individual survey reports have been made to each of the colleges surveyed. A number of the institutions published in special bulletins the more important findings of their own surveys. A sixty-page summary of the findings of the surveys of the educational institutions also appeared early in 1928 in the large volume, *Survey of Service, Disciples of Christ*, a volume which includes a report of the findings of surveys of all of the activities maintained by Disciples of Christ. A more comprehensive report which includes a summary and interpretation of the findings of the surveys of all of the colleges and universities has been prepared by the writer in collaboration with Professor Dale Russell, of the University of Kentucky, and is now ready for publication under the title *College Organization and Administration, A Report Based Upon a Series of Surveys of Church Colleges*.

In discussing my topic, "The Colleges of the Disciples of Christ," I shall draw my material largely from the final chapter of the survey report which is entitled "Present Status of the Institutions." Mention will be made first of the deficiencies of these institutions. These include items such as the following: (a) poorly organized boards of control; (b) poor administrative organization; (c) inadequate plants and equipment; (d) unsatisfactory utilization of building space; (e) curricula which are inadequate for the needs of the institutions; (f) unsatisfactory

methods for the measurement of instruction; (g) insufficient recognition of individual differences among students; (h) inequalities among staff members with reference to instructional loads; (i) inadequate salaries and poorly trained teachers; (j) unsatisfactory methods of accounting and of budgetary procedure; (k) courses and departments which are more expensive than can be justified on the basis of the service rendered; (l) courses and departments which are being maintained at a cost so low as to make impossible effective instruction; (m) programs which are more extensive and, also, more expensive than they ought to be, in view of available funds; (n) scholarships and loan funds poorly administered. Some of the deficiencies mentioned were found to exist in a majority of the twenty-eight institutions surveyed while others were found to exist in only a few of these institutions. These deficiencies are very similar in their nature to those which I have observed in colleges of other denominations, and also in some of the state controlled institutions which I have had an opportunity to study.

Some of the deficiencies of the colleges of the Disciples can be traced directly to a lack of sound educational and financial training upon the part of the administrators. Others appear to be due to a narrow conception upon the part of those in authority of the problems of an institution of higher learning supported by a religious constituency. Perhaps the chief difficulties of the colleges of this group through the years have been their local independence and their lack of funds for adequate support. A few of the weaker institutions are still so poorly supported that it appears probable that they may shortly pass out of existence. Possibly they ought to pass out of existence soon unless more adequate funds can be obtained for their support. Some of the older institutions, also, have had for years to limit greatly their educational programs because of this lack of funds. It is not fair to place the major part of the responsibility for the shortcomings of the schools, foundations, colleges and universities upon the institutions themselves. The conclusion that these shortcomings should be placed, not upon the institutions, but upon the supporting constituency is inevitable.

Regardless of the deficiencies of these institutions, a study of the recent improvements which have been made leaves one opti-

mistic concerning the future of most of the members of the group. During recent years, conditions have improved markedly. I shall discuss briefly a number of the more important of the changes which have taken place since the first visits were made by the members of the survey staff. Many of these changes are direct results of the surveys and have been based upon the survey recommendations.

During the entire history of the survey movement in higher education, I know of no group of colleges and universities which has taken survey findings more seriously or has made greater efforts to bring about the changes recommended by the survey staff. Some of the institutions accepted and put into operation every recommendation made. All but one or two of them accepted most of the recommendations. Considering the twenty-eight institutions as a group, more than 95 per cent of the survey recommendations have been officially accepted and the changes recommended have already been made. Possibly the effectiveness of the surveys may be attributed in part to the fact that the reports made to the individual institutions were semi-confidential in character, and in some instances were made available only to the Board of Education, the college board of trustees, the administration, and the faculty. In this way the deficiencies of the individual institutions were not advertised to the world; consequently, the colleges did not feel called upon to defend the *status quo*, but were free to make changes wherever changes appeared desirable. While it is true that those phases of the survey of general interest have already been published in brief form, and are to be published at greater length in the general survey report which deals with the institutions as a group, yet in the published reports, in many of the tables and charts presented, the institutions are given numbers instead of names. This makes identification of the institutions impossible for all except those who are directly concerned.

I shall now enumerate the improvements which have taken place since the survey was begun.

During the four-year period that the survey was under way, the value of buildings and grounds of the member institutions increased 30 per cent, the value of instructional equipment in-

creased 50 per cent, and the value of the working libraries increased 100 per cent.

Prior to the time the surveys were made there had been apparent a marked tendency for the institutions to plan extensive building programs and, in some instances, to spend for buildings, funds which ought to have been used for instructional equipment or for faculty salaries. The survey reports showed clearly that the degree to which building space was being utilized in many of the colleges was very low. The findings of the survey staff led a number of these institutions to arrange more carefully their schedules of classes. Reorganized class schedules made it possible for the colleges to care for increased enrolments without the necessity of expenditures for new buildings. Thus, funds which otherwise would have been expended for new buildings were made available for faculty salaries and for other instructional expenditures.

The last five years have witnessed marked improvement in the curricula of most of the colleges. This expansion has taken the form of additional offerings in all phases of social science, a field in which there had been but little development in these institutions prior to 1922 or 1923.

During recent years there has been marked improvement in the general standards of work maintained by the Disciples' institutions. In 1911 there was no college or university of this group whose graduate students could qualify for entrance without condition in the better graduate schools of America. With the exception of Drake University and Butler University, graduates from all of these institutions were required to take two years of work beyond the bachelor's degree in order to obtain a master's degree from any of the reputable universities of America. By 1920, this situation had been greatly improved. During that year four institutions were found upon the accredited lists of the regional associations. Since 1920, the requirements of the regional standardizing associations have been raised markedly; yet twelve of the Disciples' institutions now hold membership with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools or with the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States.

For a number of years educational standardizing associations and other educational organizations have discouraged the offering of a multiplicity of degrees by small institutions. Ten years ago most of these colleges advertised courses leading to seven or eight different degrees. However, many of the colleges which formerly followed this practice are now limiting the number of degrees which they award to two or three. In 1920 the scope of the work advertised by many of these institutions ranged from that of the first year of the academy to graduate work leading to the degree of Master of Arts; yet the graduate students were in the same classes with senior-college students and, in many cases, in the same classes with junior-college students. Since 1920, all but two of the institutions have discontinued their preparatory departments, and all but a few of the institutions, and those the stronger ones, have discontinued entirely their graduate work.

The faculties of the colleges and universities are much better trained now than they were five years ago. During the past five years the percentage of teachers with the Ph.D. degree or the equivalent in training has more than doubled, and the percentage of teachers holding either the M.A. or the Ph.D. degree has increased by one-half. Five years ago approximately 25 per cent of the teachers employed had no degrees. At the present time the number of teachers without degrees is so small as to be considered negligible.

The economic pressure brought upon the colleges and universities of Disciples of Christ by increased costs, enforced by pressure from the Board of Education and by the recommendations of the survey staff, has led to determined efforts upon the part of these institutions to bring about more careful institutional bookkeeping and budgeting. When this survey was begun five years ago, only two of the institutions were operating under a budget plan and none of them had accounting systems which enabled them to compute the actual cost of conducting their programs. Now more than one-half of them have adopted the budget plan of control, and almost all of them have revised their accounting systems to make possible the computation of educational costs.

The colleges are making strenuous efforts to improve the quality of instruction. A beginning is being made in the use of scientific techniques in the study of instructional procedures. Some institutions have adopted the plan of providing for classroom observation and the supervision of instruction by an administrative officer specially trained for this purpose. Studies have been made of the classification of students, the working load of students, and duplication in the content of courses. The effectiveness of the use of certain classroom devices, such as the lecture-demonstration method for the teaching of science classes, objective testing, and remedial work in reading, as means of improving scholarship, has been tried out, and those devices which have been found valuable are now being employed. Administrative measures for individualizing instruction, orientation programs, and the grouping of students into class sections upon the basis of ability are also being employed as means of improving instruction.

These efforts to improve instruction are evidences of the results of the scientific method at work in the analysis of the problems of higher education. During the past two or three summers a large number of staff members of the colleges included in this group have registered for courses in higher education in universities where such work is offered. Virtually all of the recommendations which have been made to the respective colleges with reference to educational programs and internal reorganization have been, or are now being, consummated.

May I summarize by stating that although many deficiencies exist in the administration, organization, and instructional facilities of the colleges surveyed, one should not lose sight of the many improvements which have recently been made. These improvements have affected practically all phases of the activities of the institutions. They include more adequate physical facilities, a better utilization of building space, improved curricula, the abandonment of preparatory departments and of graduate work, the discontinuance of the practice of granting a multiplicity of degrees, better trained faculties, increased salaries, improved business methods, and improved methods of instruction.

A FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM OF VOLUNTARY SUNDAY BIBLE STUDY COURSES FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS*

MARTIN S. BRYANT, Baptist University Pastor at the
University of Illinois

In mapping out a program of religious education for the college student which shall be at all adequate there are four things which should be borne in mind, (1) the amount and nature of the religious knowledge which the student brings with him, (2) the status of religious thinking in the country at the time, (3) the religious psychology of the adolescent mind, and (4) the ultimate goal of all religious teaching. These are the things which should determine the courses to be used, the type of teachers and the method to be pursued.

As to the first of these—the amount and nature of the religious knowledge which the student brings with him—the average student when he enters college brings but very little religious knowledge with him and more often than not what he does bring is irrational. He comes to college with the mind of an eighteen-year-old as respects his intellectual development and the mind of a ten-year-old as respects his religious concepts. And he comes to college having been taught a literal rather than a literary conception of the Scriptures, only later to find himself in mental confusion when he comes to see that what he has been taught does not square up with the pretty well established facts of modern knowledge and that there is a conception of the Scriptures different from that which he has been taught. I am convinced that the percentage of students who lose out in their religious faith in college because of any adverse or antagonistic classroom teaching is far less than the percentage of those who lose out because of inadequate or erroneous religious teaching before they ever left home. It is our task and obligation to take these students and give them what religious teaching we can—a knowledge which makes its appeal both to the heart and the

* A paper presented at the meeting of the North Central division of the Conference of Church Workers in Universities and Colleges, Chicago, January 1, 1929.

head, a knowledge which shall be of such a nature that it shall contain the correct conception of the Scriptures, that conception which coincides with the present-day known facts of science and history. It is this scientific, historical and chronological conception of the Scriptures which is making the Bible in all its parts reasonable, wonderful, explicable and acceptable.

There is a close relationship between this fact and the second thing which must be borne in mind in mapping out our program of religious education, *viz.*, the status of religious thinking in the country today.

There can be no doubt but that the core of the unhappy, tragic and harmful religious controversies which have been divisively sweeping over our country is the misconception as to the origin and nature of the Bible, primarily, of course, the Old Testament, and of that the Book of Genesis in its opening chapters. There seems to be a recurrence of the idea that the writers were writing to teach science rather than to teach men of God and His relationships to human life; there seems again to be the idea that the Scriptures are to be interpreted in their entirety literally rather than as a great divine library—religious literature with its story and song; its folk-lore and traditions; its biography and annals; its poetry and drama; its history and prophecy; its sermons and prayers; its allegory and parable; and its apocalypse, its letters and treatises—every book written for a specific religious purpose with a specific historical setting and growing right up naturally out of the spiritual life of the people who formed a religious community. Haven't we an obligation at this point? I want my students to know these things. It is for that reason, as I shall indicate later, that two of the courses in our program of religious education deal with the origin and nature of the Bible. I want them to see that to attempt to interpret the Scriptures without something of a knowledge of science and without a good Hebrew history right at hand is to run a very great risk of doing violence to our sacred Scriptures—God's Holy Word.

For the best and perhaps the most recent Hebrew histories, I recommend Bailey and Kent's *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*, Scribner's, and Miss Knott's *Student's History of the*

Hebrews, Abingdon Press. I want my students to know that the purpose of the Scriptures is not to teach science, but to teach of God: not to bring all people everywhere to an absolute uniformity of belief in all things pertaining to the realm of religion, but to shed sufficient light whereby all people everywhere can find God for themselves. I want them to note that Paul when writing to Timothy did not speak of the Scriptures as being profitable for instruction in science or history or anything else except righteousness that the man of God might be complete, furnished completely unto every good work. What havoc is being wrought by teaching a wrong conception of the Bible! Is it not right here that we as university pastors are to make our greatest contribution but it takes reverent and patient study upon our part and perhaps courage as well. But it must be done.

The third thing which must be borne in mind in mapping out our program of religious education is the religious psychology of the adolescent mind. I wonder if you have all made a careful study of the book, *The Religious Consciousness*, by Pratt, of Williams College. If you haven't, you should.

The religion of the adolescent is a religion of reason. He is always asking why. He wants to be shown. His enlarging intellectual powers want reasons rather than dogma or quotations from Scripture. He is in the period, when if he were to love the Lord his God at all, he wants to do it, not with all his credulity, but, as Jesus said, with all his mind. He no longer is willing to accept merely because he has been taught so or merely because the Bible says so, or because his pastor preaches it. These to him are external authority. What he needs is internal authority, and that must be the ultimate goal, but meantime the university pastor must realize that the student must pass through this period of adolescence when he desires evidences, when the reason is in control and when it must be satisfied or he will have nothing more to do with religion. He wants to see it. He is not to blame. It is a psychological characteristic of the mental making of adolescence. He hasn't yet come to the point where he will accept on faith and let faith lead him to the truth. He is in that period when the intellect and not the heart wants to rule supreme. It is natural. It is not abnormal. How often I start in with a

student who comes to me with a mix-up between his scanty science or philosophy and his still scantier religion by assuring him that his case is not unusual or unnatural. I tell him I was once there myself. I tell him that that is one of the indications that he is normal psychologically. I then go into the problem with him, assuring him that if he will keep his grip on God that he will ultimately come to the next stage of his religious development, when his religion will be a matter of his heart, when he won't be disturbed if his problems are not all solved and that the greatest authority he will have for his Christian faith will be the authority of his own personal experience. How critical is the period! How he needs a pastor who will not adopt that most lamentable of all methods—that of negative repression when dealing with honest questions, but who can sympathetically and lovingly bridge over this period of religion of the intellect and satisfy such intellect and bring him safely through until he comes to that next stage of the religion of the heart.

How shall I illustrate this? May I illustrate it by showing you how I developed recently with a group of students the thought of Fosdick's chapter upon "The Naturalness of Religion." I started out by taking them back to King Hammurabi of Babylon, of 2200 B. C.—more than 4,000 years ago. I told them of the Hammurabi stone which was unearthed about twenty-five years ago and a replica of which I had seen and on which were 800 lines narrating King Hammurabi's devotion to the gods. I took them to King Tut's tomb, showing them why the ancient Egyptians embalmed—that the soul might have a body in which to live. I took them to ancient Assyria showing them some of their religious practices. I told them of Jephthah and the early Hebrews attempting to appease Jehovah by the offering up of their own children as sacrifices to Him. I took them into Greece with her twelve Dieties and into Rome with her traditions of Romulus being taken to heaven on the wings of the gods. I then came down through the centuries stopping in Athens with Paul in the first century, showing Paul finding the altars to the many Gods. I took them for a trip to the nations of the Orient at the present time, showing them how our missionaries have yet to go to a single non-Christian land but that when they get there they

find the people with some kind of worship. I then pointed out to them how in our own day and land men in times of national calamity, in times of critical personal danger, in times of crushing responsibility, in times of sorrow, who had never turned to God, do turn to Him. I then asked the rhetorical question, by saying, "Young people, in the face of all that, who dare say there is nothing to religion?" I then said, "Young people, what do such things teach us?" and they said, "Man is by his very nature a religious being," and I said, that is the very first fundamental principle of our Christian faith and that is where we will begin in this course. Their intellects were satisfied—then we were ready to proceed to business. I don't know what you think but I knew from past experience that I had started for their hearts through the avenue of their minds—the predominating, psychological characteristic of their adolescent period.

Perhaps you would be interested to know what we did at the second lesson. I said to them, "If then, we are by our very natures religious beings, what are we going to do about it?" and we developed out together three points: (1) there is needed in every one of us a normal religious development, (2) there is needed in every one of us an improvement in the quality of our religious conceptions and our prayer life, (3) there is thrust upon the church a tremendous responsibility to develop through the processes of religious education and otherwise the spiritual natures of our children and youth that a soil may be prepared to receive the seed, which is the word, later.

The fourth thing to be borne in mind in mapping out an adequate program of religious education for the college student is the ultimate goal of all religious teaching. I do not need to mention it. We all agree in it—a vital religious experience expressing itself in Christian character and in Christian service. It is for this that the program exists. It is for this that the teacher teaches. Intelligence in the realm of our Christian faith is a roadway to God, but the end of the touring is a personal fellowship which transfigures life. To spend one's life in the realms of reason alone is to spend it in a cold-storage box. The very atmosphere of the class can be so charged with spiritual

life through prayer and otherwise as to make Christian experience and Christian character contagious. The teacher who does not bear this in mind should not be teaching.

I said at the outset of this paper that the four things to be borne in mind in mapping out our program of religious education determined the course to be used, the character of the teacher and the method to be pursued.

We have in our Baptist work at the University of Illinois a seven-year program of courses in religion ranging from the freshman course through three years of work for graduate students.

For the first semester of the freshman year we use Fosdick's *Meaning of Faith*—a series of studies in the ideas and principles upon which the Christian life is based. I know of no book which so deepens the spiritual life, clarifies religious thinking and strengthens Christian conviction for students as does this book. I use the development method, keeping a lesson ahead of the class and then asking them to carefully read that chapter before the following Sunday. The second semester we take up "The Making and the Meaning of the Old Testament." We make this a sincere and reverent attempt to answer in a satisfying way honest questions of those who wish to know what is the present-day conception of the historical, chronological and literary development of the Old Testament Scriptures. The students have in their hands copies of the American Standard Version Bible, with their pencils for notations and colored crayons for marking the documents. They treat their Bibles like a textbook. I use for reference book, Bewer's *The Literature of the Hebrews in its Historical Development*. What a joy this course is to me! I will have a class of forty to fifty in it next semester. In it I see students come over to a viewpoint and conception of the Bible which they can accept and become lovers of the Old Testament. I see many in this course prevented from ditching religion, the Bible and the church. Here is something which does not conflict with their newly found scientific and historical knowledge.

The first semester of the sophomore year the course is on the Hebrew prophets—a study of that series of outstanding religious leaders of the several centuries before Christ whose messages

permanently influenced the world as have no others except those of Jesus Himself. This course uses Miss Chamberlain's *The Hebrew Prophets*. The second semester they take up "The Making and the Meaning of the New Testament," using Goodspeed's *The Story of the New Testament*. The juniors use the first semester Rall's *Life of Jesus*, and the second semester his *Teachings of Jesus*. The first semester of the senior year the course used is *The Life of Paul* by Robison, and during the second semester the course in religious pedagogy, *How to Teach Religion* by Betts. Our graduate class follows a three-year cycle, studying, one year, Barton's *Religions of the World*, the following year Nichol's *The Growth of the Christian Church*, and the third year *The Literature of the Old and New Testaments*. This semester, after revising the lists, we have 132 enrolled in the five student courses, purchasing \$175.00 worth of books.

Thus far we have not had great difficulty in securing teachers. I lead the freshman class myself, both because I love to and because I believe I should. Otherwise we use faculty members, usually permitting them to teach but one semester a year. In this way we can demand more of them and use the leverage of their being asked to teach but one semester in the year. We rarely ask one to lead a course until we have known him for a semester or a year. We want him to have caught our vision and spirit first, and we want also to be assured as to his character, viewpoint and pedagogy. And we want to know whether he is merely teaching religion or whether he is primarily teaching students. Our most ready teachers are those who had their college courses in institutions where we have university pastors. Of the nine faculty members helping us this year—eight teaching and one as chairman of our Council upon Religious Education—six of them had both their college and graduate courses in state universities and two had their graduate work in state universities. In all these state universities we have university pastors. Three of the six have been entirely our own products. At the present time we are no doubt rearing leaders for our classes in the future.

As to method, we use the development method and the special report method, with some discussion, of course, mixed in. We

rarely use the lecture method. We take but little stock in the so-called "discussion group." In such a group the students air their immature and unthought-out ideas and hobbies and the time is used up and the subject matter is not got across to their hearts and heads. That is not education in religion.

There are four things which I should say further. First: This program did not grow up over night. It has been more than sixteen years in buiding both as to content and momentum. Second: I do not do it alone. We have a Council upon Religious Education of eleven members—two from each of the five student classes and a faculty man as chairman. They have a monthly meeting in connection with their work of planning and checking up. On January 20th they are to have an entire 6:30 evening service for a "Booster" in the interests of the second semester courses, when there will be a book exhibit, introduction of the second semester course leaders, and words relative to their courses by them, some prepared testimonies from selected students as to what these courses have meant to them, ordering of books, etc. Third: Our unified service of morning worship and Bible study courses is in our favor. Every emphasis is put upon the service of worship, at 10:30, and then as the organ plays softly, immediately following the sermon, the classes pass quietly into their classrooms and when the bells ring at exactly 12:20 everybody is at once dismissed. Fourth: Do not get the impression for one moment that this work is without its problems. We have them the same as you do, but we try to pray them through and think them out and go right straight ahead doing the best we can.

The Executive Committee of the Council of Church Boards of Education met in New York, Wednesday, April 3. The work of the first quarter of the year was reviewed, business referred to the Committee by the Council in January was developed, the budget for 1929 adopted, and plans laid for an aggressive program. It was decided that the office of the University Secretary should be in New York, and that the next Annual Meeting should be held in either Washington or Atlantic City.

RELIGION AND CATHOLICITY

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

President of Columbia University

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It would be difficult for me to overstate my feeling and my conviction as to the large importance of this gathering. Great oaks from little acorns grow. It may be that out of this group, as a beginning, heralded by such significant, eloquent and moving discourses as those to which we have just listened from Father Ross and Rabbi Landman, a movement may be begun that will regenerate a public opinion that sorely needs regeneration.

Any old-fashioned American like myself, imbued from childhood with belief, eager belief, in the fundamental principles of our government and social order, could only have passed through the months of last summer and autumn with shame and humiliation. Rarely have I, actively participating in affairs, been so depressed, so humiliated and so chagrined as by the multiplied evidences that our public opinion had drifted far from the foundations upon which the fathers had built it.

This is no fanciful undertaking to which you have set your hands. It is serious, it is difficult, it is bound to be of long continuance; because the task is to restore and to strengthen a fundamental faith—a fundamental faith that is religious, a fundamental faith that is political, a fundamental faith that is social, a fundamental faith that is individual. And upon that faith, restored and strengthened, must be built conduct—conduct personal, conduct group, conduct national.

My privilege is primarily to welcome this company for these grave and high purposes to this university. To no place on this continent could you have come more fitly. And I shall read you the words which are the ground of that statement.

Almost one hundred and seventy-five years ago the charter of this institution granted by King George II of England, passed the seals and brought what is now Columbia University into existence. That charter contained these words. After granting to the governors of the college and their successors the general

powers of government and control of the institution, the charter then provides:

These governors may set down in writing such laws, ordinances and orders for the better government of the said College and students and ministers thereof as they shall think best for the general good of the same, so that they are not repugnant to the laws and statutes of that part of our Kingdom of Great Britain called England, or of our said Province of New York, and do not extend to exclude any person of any religious denomination whatever from equal liberty and advantage of education, or from any of the degrees, liberties, privileges, benefits or immunities of the said College on account of his particular tenets in matters of religion.

Those words were written in 1754. They represented the conviction, the high spirit and the ideals of the founders of Kings College of the Province of New York, which is now Columbia University. And it has been our endeavor, as it must lawfully be the endeavor of those who come after us, to live up to those words.

Some twenty-five years ago we built for this university a chapel for religious service. After it had been completed, Bishop Potter, a dear friend, a trustee of the university, said to me one day, "Mr. President, when are you going to consecrate the chapel?"

I said, "Bishop, I do not propose to consecrate the chapel. I propose to have it dedicated."

"But, why?" he asked.

"Because," I replied, "if I consecrate the chapel, you are Bishop; if I do not consecrate the chapel, I am Bishop"—to which Bishop Potter replied that I was entirely right, that he had not thought of it, and that the pulpit of the chapel of Columbia University should be free to any human being with a message of the spirit to give or to take.

The setting forth of ideals and principles by Father Ross and Rabbi Landman is well nigh perfect. Let me add briefly to what they have said some reflections which grow out of the problem that immediately confronts us.

Our real task, as I conceive it, is to examine, to strengthen, to purify and to restore the spiritual tradition in civilization, the spiritual inheritance of mankind and the spiritual habit of the individual. That task has been multiplied in difficulty by modern economic and political conditions.

There was a time when state and church were co-extensive, even identical, and when this sort of problem only presented itself in the single but acute and difficult form outlined by Rabbi Landman. With the advent of the democratic system, however, and general participation in formulation of policies of government and the choice of officers of government, there began to be, as long ago as the sixteenth century, continuing from time to time, groupings within the state that were not primarily political but that were ecclesiastical, theological or religious. And those three terms, while having much in common, are far from being identical.

Those groupings proved so harmful that it was against them that just such a declaration was made as that which I have read from the original charter of Kings College. They were so harmful that Thomas Jefferson drew and caused to be enacted that famous statute of the Colony of Virginia in support and defence of religious liberty. They were so harmful that when the Constitution of the United States came to be drawn there was specific protection of the individual's right of religious judgment and of religious worship, without political discrimination or disadvantage.

And no American, without violation of the spirit and the letter of the Constitution, can fix any test, religious in character, for public confidence or public office; nor can he support any statute or undertaking which limits or harmfully restricts the freedom of the individual to worship that conception of God which is his in such way as he may choose.

Our government went farther than that. It is not known, save to a few curious-minded students of our public history, that early, indeed in the administration of Washington himself, it was made the supreme law of this land that our government was in no wise founded upon the Christian religion. That was done in a treaty negotiated by the administration of Washington, ratified by the Senate and made the supreme law of the land, with a Musselman people, in order to remove their prejudices and fear of persecution. The exact language of that treaty is this: "As the Government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion, as that is in

itself no character of enmity against the laws, religion or tranquility of Musselman," etc., etc.

In other words, the barrier erected by the fathers between church and state was complete, or they thought it was, and effective, or they thought it was. And when that barrier is broken down, or attempted to be broken down, we are waging war not upon some other form of religious belief or worship but we are waging war upon the foundations of the American political and social order.

That, I conceive, is the first fact to fix in our minds. In other words, this whole problem with us in the United States arises and belongs in the sphere of liberty and has nothing to do with the sphere of government. It belongs in that sphere which we have reserved to ourselves in building up a government with limited powers, that sphere in which we move about as we please in our personal relationships, our social, economic, industrial choices and preferences, our religious beliefs and forms of worship.

This point needs emphasis because it simplifies our problem. If we had to reckon with any form of established religious church, order or faith, the problem would be quite different. We have not. We have simply ourselves to reckon with. And government has no concern in it whatever, direct or indirect.

What, then, is our concern? In this sphere of liberty, reserved, in which we move with freedom, our concern, as I conceive it, is primarily, as I said a moment ago, with the spiritual element in civilization, the spiritual inheritance of mankind, the spiritual life of the individual.

That spiritual inheritance goes back to the very beginnings of the race. Before Judaism was, there was religion. Long before Christianity was, there was religion. And it is with that common denominator of it all that we are primarily concerned. Those great fundamental relationships, insights, aspirations, modes of expression, which are faith and worship—they are the common denominator of the spiritually-minded and of the religiously-minded among men. Our differences are the numerator of the fraction.

Sometimes those numerators are small and our differences correspondingly great. It is a small numerator between Christianity and Judaism. It is, or has been, a small numerator between Catholicism and Protestantism. It is a fairly large numerator between different denominations of Protestant Christianity. But these differences, whether they reach down deep to fundamentals or whether they lie on the surface and have to do chiefly with minor matters of forms of worship and discipline, of ecclesiastical order or of some particular, single fragment of religious conviction—these are the numerators.

The task before this group and those who come after it, I conceive to be to seek out the denominator, to make it as large as it may be, to see to it that it grows, increases year by year, generation by generation, that it is understood, and, when the numerators have been reduced to their lowest terms, to respect the right of every spiritually-minded human being to have his own numerator over that common denominator.

Difficult? Very, very! Ignorance—massive, colossal ignorance—is the first enemy in the path. Prejudice—bitter, longstanding prejudice, which has seized hold of the blood, that tempers the form of expression—is the other.

If we can fight ignorance and conquer prejudice, we can get to a point where the common denominator will grow larger and larger and where the numerators, even though they grow smaller and smaller, will be increasingly regarded and respected.

There is one admirable introduction to the successful prosecution of this task, and that is constant and familiar contact and intercourse with those who, sharing our common denominator, have a numerator different from our own.

One of the misfortunes of our American social order is the tendency, particularly in the smaller, more isolated and rural communities, for the populations to build their entire life about their ecclesiastical relationships. There are many communities in this land—small, isolated and unimportant, if you please—where one's social acquaintance and contacts and intercourse hardly extend beyond a little group who worship each week at one and the same church or synagogue. That is unfortunate in high degree and is a purely artificial and self-made restriction

which large-minded, broad-minded, truly catholic men and women ought to be able to remove.

It has been my fortune (and I dwell upon it because it has brought great happiness and satisfaction) to know intimately in this and other lands great spiritual personalities whose numerator was different from mine. I have nothing that I would give in exchange for having met and talked with John Henry, Cardinal Newman, to have been in his presence, to have had the benediction of his personality, and then to have read his epoch-making books and his marvelously spiritual poetry. These were experiences never to be forgotten and they meant a liberal education in the point of view of a great exponent of another numerator.

We had in this country (honored, I am glad to say, by this university with its highest degree) a great spiritual teacher and leader in John Lancaster Spaulding, Catholic Bishop of Peoria, in the State of Illinois, a lineal descendant of the royal house of Lancaster, trained at Rome and at Louvain, orator, essayist, critic, poet, great preacher, who carried wherever he went a catholicity that was genuine and pure and that had in it a place for the differing numerator of every other sincere-minded man.

When you come to know great personalities who are devout and scholarly Jews, who are devout and scholarly Catholics, then Protestantism becomes a very different thing from the narrow, contentious, much-divided sectarianism which often goes by that name.

Years ago I was in the city of Damascus, long before there were railroads or ease of access. And I was in conversation with the governor, the Turkish governor, of that province. I asked him some questions about the Christian missionaries, whom I had found to be devoted men, making great sacrifice in that part of the world. This handsome Turk looked at me with a smile. He said he believed they were useful but that, in particular, he applauded the service of the medical missionary. And he named the famous Dr. Post, who for a long generation at Beirut had practically raised the standard of living and the public health of tens of thousands of persons by his care, particularly, of women and of children and of those who suffer, as they

do in that part of the world, so terribly from infectious disease of the eye.

I pressed my question. I said: "Excellency, do these Christian missionaries convert Mohammedans to Christianity?"

"Oh, no," he said, "they never do that."

I said, "What do they do?"

"Oh," he said, "they convert one kind of Christian to be another kind of Christian."

"But," I said, "why do they not convert Mohammedans?"

He said, "I will tell you. We have in Beirut five different Christian mission stations. Each one says that it is the only true form of Christianity. And we say to them that if they will go back to America and agree among themselves as to which is right and then will come and tell us, we shall be very glad to listen."

That is an absolutely accurate version of a conversation with a Turkish gentleman thirty-five years ago, and it reflects perfectly the attitude of men of his type and class.

What that means, ladies and gentlemen, is that we should think less of our numerators, more of our common denominator. And, I repeat, if we can find ways and means, while respecting, understanding, these different numerators, to enlarge and to multiply the common denominator and bring back into the life of this nation and through it more largely into the life of the world a true sense of spiritual values, a deeper spiritual insight and a truer religious instinct and experience, we shall have done about as great a deed as is now remaining to be done.

When I went back to Germany after the war, I was anxious to find out what had happened in the intellectual and social and spiritual life of the people that was significant, what had taken place that was not recorded in the daily press or in the doings of government. And I learned, to my surprise and to my gratification, that the most marked happening in Germany since the war had been a wide-spread revival of interest in religion, a turning to religion with a desire more largely to understand, to appreciate and to enter in. One of the wisest and most learned of my informants told me that not since Schleiermacher (and

that is all of one hundred years ago) had there been so wide an interest in religion in Germany.

One curious thing is happening among American undergraduate students at the present time which could not have been predicted. They have been hearing and reading for the greater part of a generation that religions are forms of superstition, that they are completely undermined and overthrown by modern psychology, modern philosophy, modern physical science, and that they are to be placed more or less in the museums of curiosities.

But this question arises in their mind. These young men and young women, studying the history of the Western world, studying the story of its politics, its literature, its art, its music, its institutional life, finding themselves confronted at every turn by religion, its dominant influence, its enormous effect, are now asking this rather searching question: "How does it happen that something which has played so great a part and been so influential for two thousand years is no longer of any importance? What has happened?"

For one, I am perfectly content to leave them with that question and know of no better way to begin the study of modern religion than that: "What has happened to destroy all at once, in a short generation, a series of aspirations and influences and beliefs and habits and knowledges which for two thousand years have been dominant in the Western world? What has happened?"

Perhaps, as this group continues its important conferences and discussions—perhaps, you will come upon that question, you will formulate some mode of approach to its answer and you will assist those who are offering guidance to the American youth of today and tomorrow to re-enter into the temple of faith and re-understand the significance of belief and of worship.

I leave these questions, my friends, with you, in all seriousness. They are deep, profound, far-reaching. Nothing more hopeful has happened, within my purview, than that this representative, influential and powerful group has come together to undertake their examination, discussion and possible answer.

APPOINTMENT OF CHURCH ADVISERS AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

President Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia University, recently announced three appointments to the staff of religious advisers to the student body. They are the Rev. J. Elliot Ross, for Catholics; Baruch Braunstein, for Jews, and the Rev. Omar P. Goslin, for Protestants. Referring to these appointments Dr. Butler said:

The religious element of human culture is essential. By some effective agency, whether the family, the church, or the school, it must be presented to every human being whose education aims at completeness of proportion.

For some time the university has felt a responsibility for the further development of religious work with students. After a careful study of the situation, it was decided that the best way to meet the needs of the students belonging to different churches would be to have special Catholic, Jewish and Protestant religious advisers supported by their respective groups.

For some years work of a general nature has been going on under the direction of the Rev. Herbert E. Evans, adviser to student religious organizations. In the new and enlarged plan, Roman Catholic, Jewish and Protestant advisers will be given every facility to reach their respective students. Offices will be furnished in Earl Hall but the budget for expenses will be met by each group concerned. There will be no elimination of the distinctive contribution each group has to make for its own members.

On the contrary, realizing the difference in approach, provisions are now being made for the religious needs of individual students. A spirit of cooperation and helpfulness will prevail among the advisers without any attempt to compromise the essential positions of their various religious groups.

This new development in the religious life of Columbia is in addition to the facilities for worship provided by the University Chapel and the provision already made for the study of religion in the curriculum. The Catholic, Jewish and Protestant representatives will have offices together in Earl Hall, which was given to the University of William Earl Dodge.

The Rev. Father J. Elliot Ross, whose services are being contributed by the Catholic group, is now the chaplain of the Newman Club of Columbia University. He has had many years' experience working with students. Baruch Braunstein is a graduate of Ohio State University and is now doing graduate work in Jewish history and religion. He is a Fellow of the National Council for Religion and Higher Education. A committee of Jewish laymen is raising the budget for his work. The services of the Rev. Omar P. Goslin are being contributed by the Park Avenue Baptist Church, of which Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick is pastor. Dr. Goslin was

former director of student work for the Baptist Church at the University of California. The Rev. Mr. Evans will continue his work, which is contributed by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., and the West End Presbyterian Church of New York City, of which the Rev. A. E. Keigwin is pastor. These men are appointed by the University, and the Administrative Board for Social and Religious Work will be responsible for the plan.

A recent survey of the religious affiliations of 1,595 students disclosed that 23.4 per cent indicated no religious preference. The surveys showed 41.4 as Protestants, 20.3 as Catholics and 14.9 as Jews.—*The New York Times*.

Nine of the ten members of the Hoover cabinet hold college degrees, and one of the ten is a college president. Harvard and the University of Michigan are each represented by three alumni, the University of Pittsburgh, University of Minnesota, Coe College, Stanford University and the State University of Iowa by one each.

The three graduates of Harvard are: Henry L. Stimson, of New York, Secretary of State, who is a member of the class of 1889, and of the Harvard Law School; Walter F. Brown, of Ohio, Postmaster General, of the class of 1892, and of the Law School, and Charles Francis Adams, of Massachusetts, Secretary of the Navy, who received his A.B. cum laude in 1888. The three Michigan alumni are: James W. Good, of Iowa, Secretary of War, who received an LL.B. in 1893; Arthur M. Hyde, of Missouri, Secretary of Agriculture, of the class of 1899, and Robert Paterson Lamont, of Illinois, Secretary of Commerce, who took his B.S. in Civil Engineering in 1891.

The new Secretary of the Interior, Ray Lyman Wilbur, is the President of Stanford University, the Alma Mater of the President and of Mrs. Hoover.—*Educational News, The Board of Education, Methodist Episcopal Church*.

THE SEMINARY WORLD

GARDINER M. DAY

SEMINARY ACTIVITIES IN NEW ENGLAND

The International Institute

One of the features of spring at the colleges in and around Boston is the International Institute which is being conducted by Mr. William Kitchen, Secretary for the Student Christian Association in New England. The purpose of the Institute is to help students to realize vividly what the world we live in is really like, and what it means to be a Christian in our present complex civilization. In the various colleges institutes are held in which experts deal with such subjects as International Relations, Interracial Relations, Industrial Relations, Missions, Prohibition and the Modern Interpretation of Religion. The aim is to start students who have never before thought on these issues, analyzing them and thinking about them. The general method is that of speeches by experts followed by general discussion. Thus the work done in the college curriculum is supplemented by visits of persons with first-hand experience in various parts of the world. In other words, instead of taking a few students away from the campus for an intensive conference, the conference is brought to the campus, making it available for everybody inasmuch as it is fitted into the regular academic life. It is too early now to predict the value and effects of the Institute as it is still in process, but it promises to be a great awakener for many students.

Inter-Seminary Conference

The most important single event among the seminaries in New England was the annual conference held February 8 and 9 at Newton Theological Institute, Newton Center, Mass. This splendid conference was largely the result of Melvin Prior, President of New England Inter-Seminary Association during the past year. Starting early in the fall he worked with great energy to have a conference that would really be of value to the representatives from all the seminaries. He was ably assisted

in every possible way by President Herrick of the Newton Institute and the faculty. The subject of the conference was "Toward a More United Church," and the aim was to approach it not merely by abstract discussion of beliefs, but by discovering practical undertakings in which every one who shares a fundamental loyalty to Christ can participate. Of the various addresses Anson P. Stokes, Jr., one of the representatives at the conference of the Episcopal Theological School, has written for us the following account:

Dean Henry B. Washburn's address dealt with "Religious Values in the Problems of Unity." In showing the importance of understanding the other man's point of view, he pointed to history. The church of about 50-200 A. D. evidenced conscious spiritual unity yet wide diversity in forms of church government. History has shown different men finding the same God in different ways. Different approaches exist today, yet there is a common unity of those who are in fellowship with Christ. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert told of the work of the Federal Council. He said that the churches are realizing the value of working together on practical problems for which we have a social responsibility.

One of the strongest challenges of the conference was presented by Mrs. Hilda Ives of the Larger Parish Movement, who told of her rural work where church unity is a matter of economic necessity due to the dwindling population. She presented an appealing picture of the ministry to these people and showed how the problem of unity was actually being met through the larger parish. Dr. Henry K. Sherrill, of Trinity Church, Boston, discussed the part that a parish minister can play in furthering unity, while Dr. Raymond Calkins of the First Congregational Church of Cambridge, gave the closing address of the conference. His theme was "And now Abideth Faith, Hope, Love, These Three." Only by emphasizing the things which abide such as a living faith, an abiding hope and a love based on both, will the churches be moving toward a more united church.

At the close of the conference the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That the New England Inter-Seminary conference, in session at Newton Theological Institute, Newton

Center, Massachusetts, on February eighth and ninth, nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, go on record as endorsing those movements which have as their basis of operation a working fellowship of those who desire to live according to the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ; and we hereby pledge ourselves as individuals to do all in our power to attain that unity in diversity which will enable us as Christian men and women to bring into the hearts and minds of all people the Kingdom of the Living God.

The officers elected for the Association for the coming year were as follows:

Russell Richardson, Yale Divinity School, *President*.

Robert W. Fay, Episcopal Theological School, *Vice President*.

John W. Black, Boston University School of Theology, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

LABORATORY IN PERSONAL RELIGION

Dr. William Adams Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, delivered the Reinicker Lectures for this academic year at the Virginia Theological Seminary. An extensive account of the lectures which were upon the subject of "Christian Unity" appears in a recent number of the Seminary *Bulletin*. In the course of his address Dr. Brown spoke of the great need today for a laboratory for the study of personal religion in which we could learn how best to harmonize the life of religious thought and action. It is worth quoting his most significant remarks on this point.

There is prevalent a certain attitude which might be called "the academic fallacy," a dualism between the life of thought and the life of action, the notion that problems can be solved if we only think and write enough about them without experimentation. To reach the basic elements of common conviction we need a laboratory for the scientific study of the religious life which will do for us in religion what the chemical and physical laboratories do for the physical scientists—change hypotheses into practical certainties. We need a laboratory of the personal life with God. Presumably the seminaries are the places for such laboratories; but if this sort of laboratory is to be set up in our seminaries, we must begin by re-emphasizing our responsibility for certainty—for only from certainty comes the passion out of which vital religion grows.

THE WORKER'S BOOKSHELF

Understanding Human Nature, Alfred Adler (Greenberg, \$3.50). A readable exposition of the individual psychology. Aside from its technical aspects, it provides much common-sense information regarding humanity, and should be of practical help to all who work with varieties of human nature.—H. T. S.

* * * * *

A Waking World, Stanley High (Abingdon, \$1.00). This is a splendid volume to put into the hands of students who question the value or necessity of missions. Mr. High has returned from a trip through mission lands, and writes both in criticism of existing policies and with a conviction that the missionary enterprise must challenge the support of intelligent Americans. The special value of the book is in pointing out the distinctive problems and needs of the people in various lands, and in indicating the special type of program which the church must carry on in these several places.—H. T. S.

* * * * *

Problems and Principles of Social Living, Sidney A. Weston (Pilgrim Press, teacher's text, 35 cents; pupil's text, 25 cents). This is a good problem-discussion course for use in the church school class with undergraduates. The "life situations" come largely from student life, and the content material provided will help leaders to steer the discussion into positive channels. The course was worked out with several groups of college young people.—H. T. S.

A Handbook of Christian Education, published as the May, 1928, issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, is a much enlarged issue of 200 pages. The *Handbook* is brimming over with facts you need daily relative to institutional personnel,—1,500 names, standards, financial resources, etc., including a directory of allied foundations and standardizing agencies. A representative of the Institute of International Education, writes:—

"The *Handbook* has been extremely helpful to us in our work. It should be in the reference library of everyone in the educational and administrative field."

Separate copies of the *Handbook* are 75c.—50c. with a subscription to CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Note CHRISTIAN EDUCATION is \$1.50—\$2.00 for both. This opportunity will soon pass since there are only a few numbers of the *Handbook* left.